

Remarks/Arguments:

Applicants thank the examiner and his supervisor for the courtesy of the telephone interview. A summary of the interview is included in the comments below.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, the Office Action indicating it is unclear when in the method the first and second configurations happen. This objection was discussed during the interview and it was explained that the two configurations are supported in the specification at least at paragraphs [0034] to [0035]. The examiner indicated that this rejection would be overcome by separating the recitation of step "3" into individual steps.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are enabled by the claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,193,031 (Baechle et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,330,259 (Ravndal et al.). Applicants traverse these rejections.

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. §2143. Additionally, as set forth by the Supreme Court in KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007), it is necessary to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the prior art elements in the manner claimed.


During the interview, the examiner acknowledged that claim 7 as amended is distinguishable over the prior art as the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not teach or suggest connecting the inlet and outlet valves and the cut-off valve in the recited first and second configurations.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 7 is in condition for allowance. Claims 8-12 each depend from claim 7 and should each be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance. Early reconsideration and allowance of each of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes an interview, either personal or telephonic, will advance the prosecution of this matter, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner get in contact with the undersigned to arrange the same.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert P. Seitter, Reg. No. 24,856
Glenn M. Massina, Reg. No. 40,081
Attorneys for Applicants

RPS/GMM/lr

Dated: April 25, 2008

☒ P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

☐ P.O. Box 1596
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 778-2500

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.